DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 290 531 PS 016 823

AUTHOR Schwartz, Audrey James
TITLE Socialization to School: A Study of Low-Income and Minority Children in an Early Childhood Setting. Occasional Paper.
INSTITUTION University of Southern California, Los Angeles. Inst. for Research in Educational Administration.
PUB DATE May 87
NOTE 54p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Cultural Differences; Cultural Interrelationships: Desegregation Effects; *Early Childhood Education; Hidden Curriculum; Integration Studies; Interpersonal Competence; Laboratory Schools; Low Income Groups; *Minority Group Children; Outcomes of Education; School Desegregation; *Socialization; *Student Adjustment; *Student School Relationship

ABSTRACT

This study is a description of the initial socialization of low-income children, aged 3 to 6 years, who were recruited by a middle- and upper-income elementary college-laboratory school. Data for this study were obtained through observations of 11 recruited children and their classmates during a 4-year period. These observations were supplemented by informal conversations, interviews, and school documents and files. It was found that although the school was perceived by the community as excellent, and had many fine qualities, the recruited children were adversely affected by other qualities. The school's pedagogy gave little attention to social outcomes such as cross-cultural and interracial understanding; the assimilationist ideology of the school excluded pluralistic curricula; and the "color-blind" universalism accepted in the school obscured the need for "affirmative" treatment of some children. It is concluded that the optimum programs for desegregated early childhood education are traditional, developmentally oriented ones in which: (1) schooling is an extension of the family; (2) a flexible pedagogy allows for recognition of children's previous and concurrent socialization; and (3) the needs of the children are considered more important than the demands of an explicit curriculum. (PCB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED290531

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Institute for Research in Educational Administration

SOCIALIZATION TO SCHOOL: A STUDY OF LOW-INCOME AND MINORITY CHILDREN IN AN EARLY CHILDHOOD SETTING

Audrey James Schwartz

Occasional Paper
May 1987

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Audrey James Schwartz
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

University of Southern California
School of Education
Department of Policy, Planning and Administration

PS 016823

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The Institute for Research in Educational Administration promotes, manages and disseminates information on research pertinent to educational administration. Utilizing the resources of the University of Southern California and its School of Education, the Institute conducts seminars, mini-courses, practicums and workshops to meet the needs of the California educational community. The Institute, as an operating unit of the Department of Policy, Planning and Administration, provides consulting services to school districts and other educational organizations using the resources of faculty, graduate scholars and recognized experts in the field of educational administration.

SOCIALIZATION TO SCHOOL:
A STUDY OF LOW-INCOME AND MINORITY CHILDREN IN AN EARLY CHILDHOOD SETTING

Audrey James Schwartz
University of Southern California

Occasional Paper

May 1987

Institute for Research in Educational Administration
University of Southern California

Los Angeles, California

CONTENTS

page

Introduction.....1

Methodology.....5

The College Laboratory School.....7

Cultural Differences among the Children.....13

Learning the Pupil Role.....20

Structure of Space.....20

Structure of Time.....24

Structure of Authority.....28

The Impact of the School on Individual Children..31

The Children's Impact on the School.....39

Summary.....41

Conclusions.....44

References.....47

Table 1. The Recruited Children by Educational Assignment and Year.....9

Introduction

What follows is a description of the initial socialization of eleven low-income Anglo, Black, and Latino children to an elementary college-laboratory school in southwestern United States. The children, ages three to six, were the youngest of 34 who were deliberately recruited by the predominantly middle- and upper-income school so that its pupils would be more representative of the national population. My decision to concentrate on the youngest children was made in light of consistent findings that interracial and interethnic acceptance and academic achievement are greatest when school desegregation occurs at the outset of schooling (Crain and Mahard, 1981; St.John, 1975).

In addition, early childhood education has become increasingly common with women's greater participation in the work force and the current stress on early acquisition of cognitive skills. An estimated 92 percent of all five-year-olds and 37 percent of all three- and four-year-olds attended school in 1982 (N.C.E.S., 1985). As this percentage expands basic questions about education for young children are anticipated. Foremost, is whether their schooling should be an upward extension of the family, as in traditional developmentally-oriented early childhood programs, or a downward extension of elementary grades, as in the newer cognitive ones. An equally important question, is how maximum educational opportunities can be provided to all children in racial-ethnic and

socioeconomic desegregated settings. Research focusing on this age group will shed light on these issues.

In initiating the study, I anticipated writing a felicitous account about the interactions among children and adults that could serve as a model for socially integrated early childhood education. Recurrent findings imply that many low-income minority children accommodate poorly to school because of the disjuncture between family and school culture (Averich, Caroll, Donaldson, Kiesling & Pincus, 1972; Coleman, Hoffer & Kilgore, 1981; Heyns, 1978). Although frequent attempts have been made to eliminate the negative link between home background and school success, there are few positive results (Hurn, 1985). From earlier observations of the Lab School and its long-standing reputation for excellence, I had reason to believe it might be successful.

The objectives of school desegregation are many: For minorities, desegregated schools are expected to facilitate personal mobility, provide access to the "good life," and increase options as adults. For society, they are expected to develop human resources more fully and prepare all children for participation in pluralistic communities. Findings from research on school desegregation agree that school attributes most related to these objectives are the social composition of the student body and the quality of teaching (Coleman, Campbell, Hobson, McPartland, Mood, Weinfield & York, 1966; Mosteller and Moynihan, 1972; St.John, 1975). Findings from studies of "effective" schools describe how interactions among pupils and teachers can create an institutional ethos to bring these objectives about (Brookover, Beady & Warfield, 1979; Rutter, Maughan, Mortimore & Ouston, 1979). Nevertheless, other studies indicate that school desegregation is but a first step which must be followed by others if a more virulent

form of racial isolation--resegregated schools with superficial stereotypes and intergroup hostility-- is to be avoided. The salient characteristic of an integrated as opposed to a re-segregated one is its social environment in which the social status of racial-ethnic minority children is equal to that of other children and their culture is reflected in the educational program (Cohen, 1972; Crain & Mahard 1981; Damico & Sparks, 1986; Mercer, Coleman & Harloe, 1974; Schofield, 1982).

Socialization to school begins upon entry as children leave the gemeinschaft context of the family and, without family members, experience its gesellschaft milieu. A substantial portion of what is transmitted in school initially relates to appropriate school behavior and values that support it. This "moral" curriculum, which not only rivals the cognitive curriculum but is often precondition to its mastery (Parsons, 1959) has been described by many trained observers.

Kanter (1972) tells of the "organizational child in nursery school, noting that teachers' perceptions of maturity and psychological health include self-reliance, achievement, social competence, and differentiation between adult and child roles. Henry (1955) writes of changes in pupils' attitudes in school so that they look organized to adults although they are reluctant to accept universalism and they compete with peers for their teachers' attention. Jackson (1968) contends that young children learn to cope with the school's major structural properties of crowds, praise, and power. In adjusting to crowds, they learn to work alone, temper impulsive action, and accept that they are part of a group. In adjusting to praise, they learn classroom expectations and how to manipulate its reward system. And in adjusting to power, they learn that school adults are superordinate and must be obeyed.

Gracey (1975) reports in his description of Kindergarten as an "Academic Boot Camp" that the first half year is spent in teaching children to follow routines with unquestioned obedience and with subjugating their spontaneity.

Building on Parsons' pattern variables, Dreeben (1968), summarizes the pupil role as containing the norms of independence, achievement, universalism, and specificity. Pupils learn to acknowledge the need to perform tasks by themselves under clearly specified circumstances, thereby learning the expectations of responsibility and accountability (independence). They perform their activities against some learned standards and eventually engage in self-evaluation and acquire behaviors appropriate to their self-assessed successes and failures (achievement). They also learn to accept being treated as a member of a category such as the pupil cohort rather than a special case as in the family (universalism). They learn that characteristics they share with others are more relevant to school than their personal qualities. And they learn that in-school adults have authority over them by virtue of their social position in the classroom (specificity).

None of the foregoing is to imply that school structures must be rigid. Programs in open classrooms and alternative schools often are structurally loose, as are developmentally-oriented early childhood programs such as Infant Schools in Great Britain. As described by Bernstein (1977), Infant Schools have an invisible pedagogy in that hierarchical relations between pupils and adults, the curriculum, and criteria for evaluation are masked. This provides flexibility for children to pursue special interests and to build on their own uniqueness which can be especially useful in pluralistic classrooms since it allows for recognition of the backgrounds of minority children whose school

work, then, can be made personally relevant and its evaluation linked to individualized objectives.

But because invisible pedagogies make few demands for conformity, they are "interrupters" rather than "reproducers" of mainstream culture. Unless children learn school-expected norms elsewhere, as perhaps in middle-class homes, lack of formal curriculum and overt structure may leave them ill prepared for the visible pedagogies usually found in higher grades. In spite of their attractiveness for minority pupils, invisible pedagogies could be disadvantageous in that they may trade psychological comfort, gratification, and intellectual interest in early years for a handicap in traditional classrooms later on.

Methodology

Descriptive data for this study were obtained through observations which yielded field notes about eleven specially-recruited children and their relevant classmates and adults between Fall, 1979 and Spring, 1983. These were supplemented by informal conversations with teachers, focused interviews with key informants, and unobtrusive measures such as school documents and pupils' files. Together they describe the social environment and selected happenings of the specially-recruited children at school.

In this, as in all observational studies, the researcher was the instrument: I conducted all interviews and spent approximately 230 hours as a non-participant observer. Although I had been denied a more active stance, participant roles in schools are so labor intensive they are not conducive to observations (Wolcott, 1973). As the research proceeded, I was

content to be merely an observer and tried to be as unobtrusive as possible, which included jotting just enough notes to write an accurate report after leaving the site.

The staff's response to the study was positive overall. With the exception of two teachers in the Elementary Division, I did not encounter the resistance noted by other observers (Wolcott, 1976). This is attributed to the frequency of visitors at the Lab School and to the teachers' professional confidence which was reinforced by the principal who, for example, publicly announced at the first Family-School meeting: "Our teachers are a galaxy of stars ...(who) know what is best for your child." If the study had led to dissemination of their pedagogy, I felt they would have been rewarded amply.

The children's reactions to being observed differed depending on their age and length of enrollment. The presence of a nonparticipating adult disturbed the budding sense of role differentiation in the youngest who would ask: "Who are you?" "Why don't you ever talk to nobody?" "What are you writing?" and so on. Some children were curious throughout the first year, whereas others seemed to understand my role and looked to see if, after watching them, I added to my clipboard notes. Older children took no special notice and apparently accepted the adult observer as a legitimate school role. For example, Consuela Lopez would stare right through me in her second year, in sharp contrast to the warm smile and generous hug she had offered after Christmas break the year before.

The College Laboratory School

The Lab School was nestled in the corner of a suburban college campus, isolated physically and visually from the college. Here some 450 children ages three to thirteen received what is generally regarded as exemplary education. Motor access was from a main city thoroughfare lined with large, well-maintained homes. A circular driveway, shielded from the street by majestic trees, facilitated direct entry into the Early Childhood Division which housed the nursery and kindergarten programs. Older children hiked across the spacious site to their isolated classroom units.

Until the special recruitment, the school administration had almost total authority to select the people in the school. It put together a staff of intelligent teachers trained in elementary-school pedagogy and assembled a pupil body of appropriate age and sex from its long list of applicants, including some middle-income minority children and a few children who elsewhere would have been relegated to "special education." Since social class representation was lacking, the associated college encouraged wider recruitment and, in response, a representative of the Lab School contacted minority and low-income parents in an area about 15 miles away who would not ordinarily apply to the school This effort produced 34 new pupils: 10 Black, 18 Latino, and six White/Anglo. The Lab School waved their tuition, provided bus transportation for the first two years, and assured parents that younger siblings would be admitted when old enough.

The "affirmative action" project was supported morally, if not tangibly, by the Department of Education faculty which initiated it and by the College admnistration. Reactions of others varied between indifference and hostility. Dissidence arose from the

fact the program appropriated 34 sought-after pupil places which College deans might have used to entice new faculty and which parents of currently-enrolled children assumed would be available for their younger children. Both groups protested unsuccessfully to the College administration. The Lab School bore the fiscal burden of the program including foregone tuition and the cost of the special bus. This program strained the school's budget and the bus was discontinued at the end of the second year when the director concluded "it could no longer be afforded." There is no evidence to suggest the school sought outside funding.

The staff did not receive advanced preparation for the specially-recruited children, nor was the recruitment discussed at its weekly meetings. Teachers were told that 34 "new" children would be coming on a school-provided bus and little was made of the children's atypical backgrounds. The assistant principal was responsible for the program's logistics, but no one was in charge of its other aspects. The nonchalance with which this program was introduced was consonant with generally-held beliefs in both the School and the associated College that the Lab School could "take care of education for all children." Issues about special preparation and outside support services did not arise.

The publicly stated objective of the recruitment was to "develop and maintain a pupil population with a wide variety of characteristics" so that the school's teaching methods "would have relevance to schooling in the nation." Nevertheless, the private views of the teachers varied. Some agreed that its purpose was to demonstrate that the school's pedagogy was sufficiently powerful to reach all pupils, whereas others said its purpose was "to find the best way to teach different kinds of children." When pressed, this latter group could not say if the search was for a number of methods

Table 1. The Recruited Children by Educational Assignment and Year.

Pseudonym Age/R-E	School Year 1979 1980	1980 1981	1981 1982	1982 1983	1983 1984	1984 1985
Carmen Gonzalez 6 yrs. Hisp.	EC	LE	x	x	x	x
Juan Gonzalez 4 yrs. Hisp.	EC	EC	x	x	x	x
Jason Johnson 4 yrs. Black	EC	EC	EC	x	x	x
Consuela Lopez 5 yrs. Hisp.	EC	LE	LE	LE	LE	UE
Jose Rojo 5.5 yrs. Hisp.	EC	x	x	x	x	x
Diego Rodriquez 5 yrs. Hisp.	EC	LE	x	x	x	x
Rosa Rodriquez 3 yrs. Hisp	EC	EC	x	x	x	x
Jorge Sanchez 5.5 yrs. Hisp.	EC	LE	LE	LE	x	x
Maria Sanchez 4 yrs. Hisp.	EC	EC	LE	LE	x	x
Donna Valentine 4 yrs. Anglo	EC	EC	EC	LE	LE	LE
Aliçe Wilson 4 yrs. Black	EC	EC	EC	LE/x	x	x

Code: EC=Early Childhood Div.; LE=Lower Elementary Div.; UP=Upper Elementary Div.; x=not attending school.

to accommodate a variety of children or for the one best method to reach them all. Still other teachers said the recruitment was so that "disadvantaged" children could be "with as good an education as was available." The nature of the disadvantage was not crystallized and apparently had not been discussed in that beliefs about the children's background also varied: some referred to poverty, some to family disorganization, and others to the comparatively low quality of their neighborhood schools. There was no mention of cultural differences, although a few teachers came to recognize disparities in English-language proficiency.

Of the eleven youngest recruited children featured in this report, eight were Latino (4 girls, 4 boys), two were Black (1 girl, 1 boy), and one was low-income White/Anglo (1 girl). There were three sibling pairs among the eight Latino children, and three Latino children and one Black child had older sibs who also started at the School. The name (pseudonym), age, and enrollment history of the eleven children are displayed in Table 1. They began in the Early Childhood Division in Fall, 1979, with 107 other regularly-enrolled middle and upper-middle class children, all of whom were White/Anglo except four (one Black boy, two Black girls, and an Asian boy). The children in Early Childhood and their six White/Anglo teachers were divided into two "teams" based on the children's age and "developmental level."

Dropout among the specially-recruited children was exceptionally high. The attrition rate at the end of three years for all 34 was estimated at 41 percent, and in the Early Childhood Division, only two were enrolled after five years. The School did not compile dropout information about regularly-enrolled children; it was rare and not seen as a problem. The obvious

disparity between the school's holding power over the recruited children and the others was noted by the Lab School's admission committee in 1982 which warned that the school was in danger of setting up a "revolving door" for its specially-recruited children.

As will be seen, the recruited children had many negative experiences in the Lab School stemming from the staff's failure to consider the school as a social system. Its professional orientation was derived from cognitive psychology and learning theory so that reciprocal relationships among classroom factors, social development, and educational outcomes were minimized (Hallinan & Tuma, 1978). Some teachers did recognize that children acquired informal roles, but concern with these roles was secondary to concern with appropriate behavior and cognitive development.

The educational orientation of the principal and most staff fits neatly into the concept of visible pedagogy as described by Bernsteirr (1977). The curriculum was planned, sequential, and means-end oriented. Many teachers were trained at the associated college and had participated in directed elementary classroom teaching at the Lab School. The approach involved a value neutral "technology" of teaching which provided teachers with a set of rule-governed procedures for classroom management and instruction covering most contingencies (O'Shea, 1984:4). The pupils were seen as "products" rather than "clients" or "members" of the school, and their behavior was monitored, checked, and controlled (Schlechty, 1985). Performance requirements were generally known, standards were explicit, and the tolerated range of deviations was small.

In terms of time-worn dichotomies such as "teaching children versus teaching subjects" and "child-centered versus teacher-centered" classrooms, the orientation was to teach "subjects" in "teacher-centered" classrooms. Metz's (1978) differentiation between "developmental" and "incorporative" teachers also is germane. All but one teacher represented the school-approved incorporative approach. According to Metz, incorporative teachers emphasize acquisition of the basic skills embodied in the curriculum, and employ an instructional method that is expected to "incorporate" the critical material into the children who are seen as "vessels to be filled." In contrast, developmental teachers are concerned more with children than with an explicit course of study and vary both methodology and subject content according to interests and perceived needs of individual children. Incorporative teachers hold that rules should cover the "proper" behavior to which children must become accustomed, whereas developmental teachers stress responsible behavior based on an understanding of the requirements of a particular situation (Metz, 1978:42-43).

Teachers reinforced one another positively for actions consistent with the school's visible pedagogy and negatively for actions that differed, although deviations must have been difficult since they usually worked in view of at least one colleague. Their belief that the Lab School could transmit appropriate behaviors and cognitive skills to pupils with the most intractable educational problems created an ambience of assuredness which further reinforced its teaching methods.

In high contrast, the orientation toward social goals was markedly unstructured. Teachers removed themselves from the children's social relationships as much as possible so as not to interfere with "naturally-occurring" behavior (Cole, 1986). Except when children

requested help to resolve disputes or when they violated rules pertaining to safety, teachers were passive observers of the children's social system. In sum, the culture of the Lab School was authoritarian and teacher-centered in the classroom where behavioral and cognitive objectives dominated, and it was laissez faire and pupil-centered on the play yard where social objectives were to be achieved.

Cultural Differences among the Children

The lack of preparation given the teachers for the specially-recruited children, their sociological naivete and their confidence in the existing program engendered a "business as usual" approach. The staff believed, as do many educators (noted by Rist, 1978 & Schofield, 1982), that a neutral, "colorblind" policy is justified in desegregated schools in which "There is no basis for making any sort of distinction on the basis of color!" But distinctions could be made between most of the recruited children and their classmates on the basis of cultural and language patterns which marked them as "strangers" intruding "upon an alien culture" (Kanter, 1977).

That the recruited children came from a different background was evident at the first monthly Family-School meeting when the sound of an infant attracted my attention. I turned to see the Sanchez family lined across the last row of the auditorium--father, six children (Jorge and Maria were in the Early Childhood Division), and mother on the aisle discretely nursing a baby behind a colorful shawl. A beep alert sounded over baby Sanchez's suckling in the pocket of the well-cut tweed jacket of a man several rows ahead. He went outside immediately and upon returning, explained

to his smartly-dressed companions that he was "on call." He left twice more, each time murmuring something about the obligations of a physician. In contrast, the Sanchez children sat quietly throughout. They were the only children present, and except for Consuela Lopez's parents, Mr. and Mrs. Sanchez were the only parents of recruited children. Neither the Lopez's nor the Sanchez's attended other Family-School meetings that year.

Differences in background also could be discerned from comments during class discussions. For example, after being told a story about a "typical" American family, the children were asked, "Who lives in your house?" An Anglo boy responded, "Mother, Father, me and my brother," followed by another who said, "Mother, Father, me, and my housekeeper." Then Consuela Lopez volunteered that living in her house were "Father, Mother, my sister, my other sister, and Abuela (Grandmother)."

In a discussion about holiday gifts in December of their first year, the teacher asked, "What can you do for presents for your parents?" An Anglo girl offered, "You can buy something with the money you save from your allowance," followed by Consuela who said, "You can find something pretty in other people's trash." She went on to explain about the rubbish bin outside a clothing factory near her friend's house where "you can find all kinds of interesting things." Her resourcefulness was shown in school near the end of that first year when she rescued a set of flash cards from the waste basket. She proudly offered them to the teacher who responded bluntly, "Nobody wants them." "I do," rejoined Consuela as she skipped off toward her "cubby" to squirrel them away.

The initial dress of some Latino children also gave a glimpse into their ethnic culture. On the first school day Consuela wore a red-checked dress over a white ruffled petticoat, white shoes and stockings, and a purse dangled from her wrist. For most of the morning she stood alone in the center of the sandpit, carefully avoiding flying sand. At the end of the day she was given a note describing appropriate school attire. After that she dressed much like the Anglo girls--mostly knitted tops and matching pants--until the photo session in mid-October when all the Latino children, and none of the others, wore their best clothes. This time Consuela, whose lace bib and ruffled dress was even more elaborate, immersed herself into the sandpit without concern and enthusiastically added water to the damp sand.

Juan Gonzalez's divergent dress was not settled as quickly. He wore white pants and a jacket the first day and he, too, was given a note. More than a week passed before his clothes were less formal, and these more seeming for grade school than preschool. Six weeks passed before he dressed like the other boys--in jeans or play clothes. From my observations of the affectionate interaction between Juan and his mother at Thanksgiving open-house, it seemed she would have done all she could to ease his school adjustment. That neither of his parents read or spoke English or that his father was unemployed could have accounted for the delay. Juan wore his white suit for the photo session. He joined Consuela in the sandpit afterwards, and with equal abandon he, too, added water to the now muddy sand.

Of the recruited children, only Juan's food preferences showed strong cultural differences. A carton of milk was provided to each child and a peanut

butter and jelly sandwich to those who did not bring their lunch. When Juan opened the school-supplied sandwich on the first day he began to sob. Diego Rodriquez, a large, socially-mature boy for his five years, moved next to him and asked, "Do you miss Mommy?" At first Juan said nothing, but later after a Spanish language interchange between them, Diego told Mrs. Beamish who was supervising the lunch that "Juan doesn't like peanut butter and jelly." She got him a plain peanut butter sandwich which he nibbled unenthusiastically. After that, Juan and his sister Carmen brought Mexican food from home--often a burrito. Diego and Rosa Rodriquez brought sandwiches on dark bread, as did Consuela and Donna Valentine. Jason Johnson and Alice Wilson, the two Black children, brought sandwiches on white bread, often accompanied by potato chips and Twinkies, which Alice typically ate first.

The critical difference between most Latino children and the others was their lack of English fluency. The teachers who had given thought to language assumed the recruited children were either bilingual or monolingual English. There was no language policy, nor was one developed during the period of the study. Juan and Carmen were affected more negatively than the others by the "de facto" immersion. Carmen, who was six, was first assigned to the Lower Elementary Division, but was moved in the second week to Early Childhood when it was determined that she was not "ready." She was a tall, thin girl, whose Latino face resembled a Picasso drawing. She seldom spoke and, then, was scarcely audible. Some teachers contended she had a speech impediment; more likely her English was heavily accented or she spoke some version of "Spanglish."

Juan seldom talked in the early weeks, and never in English. It was Mrs. Beamish who first suspected he could not understand it. After the sandwich incident she remarked: "This one needs some Spanish input; if only I had taken Spanish instead of Norwegian!" In the play yard on the second day, she said to me, "Juan is speaking over there. I've got to go where I can hear him: I think he is fooling us that he only speaks Spanish." By the third day she used the few Spanish words she knew, such as "muchacha" and "buenas dias," in an effort to communicate.

The question of Juan's possible monolingualism was settled by a pants-wetting episode at the end of the first week. Mrs. Beamish spotted him wandering about aimlessly and took him by the hand to the washroom saying, "You need a change of pants my friend." Later she reported that "He kept going and going. I guess he didn't understand." Then to Jorge Sanchez, "Tell Juan he can go to the bathroom whenever he wants to." Later she asked Jorge to "tell Juan to put on these dry pants and I'll wash his and give them back." Juan was adamant in his refusal, saying in Spanish, "My Mommy washes them." In the afternoon, Mrs. Beamish noticed Juan taking off his jacket and told him loudly to put it in his locker after which she asked rhetorically, "Why do I scream when I can't speak Spanish?" Juan seemed somewhat happier in the days that followed, although not yet outgoing. He always stayed close to a Spanish-speaking child, never participating, and always watching.

As Mrs. Beamish's concern over the absence of a language policy grew, she enlisted Consuela, Diego, or Jorge, all bilingual, to help with Juan. Once she asked Consuela to show him how to color the spaces of a ditto to reveal an image of a cat. He never mastered the task, but Consuela and Mrs. Beamish seemed to have

a lot of fun. Afterward, Mrs. Beamish thanked Consuela for teaching her Spanish, and they both giggled. When Juan began to interact with nonHispanic children, Consuela often translated his remarks. In this way he was able to communicate with others before he acquired English.

By the end of the second week Juan went to Mrs. Beamish and said, "Teacher, bathroom." Obviously pleased, she said, "He knows this one (pointing to herself) won't learn Spanish so he is trying to contact me in English." Early in November, Juan had a toileting accident on the way to school. Mrs. Beamish reported that he accepted fresh clothing this time and added with pride, "He has diarrhea of the mouth as well! He talks to me in English and makes himself understood." During November, Juan spent a lot of time in the playhouse, and although not yet an English speaker, he chattered constantly in his high squeaky voice, inserting English words willy-nilly.

By December he spoke a comprehensible combination of English and Spanish, smiled a great deal, and engaged fully in school activities. One morning on the play yard he jumped out of the tire that Donna Valentine was pushing and said, "I want to push." I reported the sentence to Mrs. Forrest, another teacher, who said, "Oh no, he doesn't speak English!" So Juan, who started in September with a false positive prophecy about English proficiency, had a false negative prophecy four months later. Nonetheless, before the Easter holidays he sang all the words to "Peter Cotton-tail" with great conviction, and the following Fall he spoke only English in school.

Another teacher, Ms. Wilson, discussed the monolingual children with me in mid-October stating that there was a "breakthough" in social relations

between the host and recruited children: "they now use their eyes and physical contact to communicate with one another." I attempted to discuss language immersion as a technique with her (Lambert & Tucker, 1972), but if she were aware of the controversy surrounding language policy for nonEnglish speakers, she did not let on. During the entire period of observation I heard no reference to bilingual education, the Federal Bilingual Education Act, Lau v. Nicols, or that language differences were a growing concern for schools throughout the Southwest.

The closest I came to this topic was on the last day of the first year in a chance encounter with Mrs. Collins, a Lower Elementary Division teacher. She told me:

> By January all the Spanish children in my division felt comfortable. A few had conceptualization problems in English, but they might have had them in Spanish too. The teachers didn't need translators to talk to parents by the end of the semester because the children can do it.

Then she added with obvious delight, "this morning a Mexican boy was very embarrassed when he admitted to the class that he didn't know any English when he started in September. And a White boy answered, °That's all right, I didn't know any Spanish either!'" She concluded that "Submersion (sic) works wonderfully, although it may appear cruel at first."

By the end of the first year all eight Latino children could speak English and knew that English was the language of the school. This was seen in May when a

student teacher, on her own, read them a Spanish-language story. When finished, she asked them a series of questions in Spanish. Each child responded in English.

The backgrounds of the two Black and one White recruited children did not differentiate them as much from those regularly enrolled. Donna Valentine, the daughter of a low-income single mother, spoke, dressed, and behaved like a child from a well-educated upper-middle class family. Alice Wilson and Jason Johnson spoke both American Standard and Black English dialects, as did the three regularly-enrolled Black children in the Early Childhood Division. Compared to the Latino children, they were social isolates. The few playmates they chose came from the recruited group which accepted them completely.

Learning the Pupil Role

During the first year all of the children began to acquire the attributes of the pupil role noted by Dreeben (1968). They exhibited behaviors associated with the norms of independence, achievement, universalism, and specificity. Acquisition of these behaviors was primarily the outcome of their interaction with the way space, time, and authority were structured.

Structure of Space

The boundary between the Early Childhood Division and all else was established the first day by Mrs. Waters when she stood at the classroom door and explained as she gestured: "That is outside; this is inside." Then she took a child who hung back in the hall with an older brother by the wrists and pulled him well into

the room. "Say goodbye to brother, he has his 'job° and you have yours. This is your job." References to work and job were common, both in the context of what "mother" and "father" do and in referring to the children's classroom assignments.

Once across the threshold, children were taught that this was their room and they were "Team E." They were given name tags signifying "Team E" to be tied around their necks which were not accepted totally: some used them as fans; some wore them backwards; some took them off altogether. Over the first two days Mrs. Waters often said, "Team E raise your hand," while raising her own. By the end of the second day most children imitated her, and when she called "Team E" on day five every child looked up with arm extended overhead. The children colored and cut out the letter "E" during that week and were encouraged to take it home on Friday. In this way they learned that they all were part of cohort "E" (Early Childhood) within the College Lab School and had acquired the beginnings of a universalistic orientation.

The classroom was divided into formal and informal activity areas. The formal area was created when the children sat on a square rug in front of the teacher who typically sat on a low chair or bench near the piano. They learned to generate behaviors appropriate to the rug, which included facing the teacher, sitting flat (not on their feet), and waiting to be recognized before speaking. They were dismissed one at a time on the basis of some achievement criterion such as excellent posture or having decided among alternatives about their next "job." This helped to transmit the norms of independence and achievement.

The rest of the classroom was for carrying out the "jobs" related to the day's objectives or for informal activities when the "job" was completed. The room contained an area with tables and chairs, a playhouse corner, a book corner, and the children's "cubbies." The most popular attraction was the adjacent open washroom. Children who completed their "jobs" or were at loose ends would wander in to see what was happening. This was the site of water play and grooming activity--both individual and cooperative. Once the shared fascination of Jason Johnson and a regularly-admitted Anglo boy for each other's hair attracted Mrs. Beamish's attention. She ordered them to "stop fingering people's heads," explaining about lice and how they spread in school. Because she enforced the rule to curtail lice infestation (a common occurrence in preschools), the boys lost an opportunity to learn about racially-related physical characteristics and may have picked up a negative racial message as well.

The playhouse was another popular place where behavior was not structured and, initially, a site of racial-ethnic integrated play. Through simulated family activities the children revealed differences in background that were ignored in the school's visible pedagogy. Much of their behavior seemed stereotypic, such as middle-class boys looking for props to represent a father's briefcase and Latino girls insisting that more of their peers assume children's roles. Various approaches to child rearing showed up, and Oneida, a five year old regularly-enrolled Black girl customarily, acted as the domineering mother. The Latino girls seldom assumed a mother role: the younger ones were invariably children, whereas older ones took some undefined adult status. Occasionally there was domestic

violence, for example, the time Juan hit an Anglo boy on the head with an aluminum pan.

The well-equipped play yard was accessible from the patio directly outside the classroom. The distinction between inside and outside related to the extent teachers were involved in the children's activities and affective behavior was tolerated: inside was primarily for group discussions and individual "jobs," whereas outside was for free play. This was not made explicit, but could be inferred from teachers' comments such as "whistling is for outside," "clean up your job and you are ready to go out and play," and "once you come inside use a quiet voice." The spontaneous animated, large motor activities of the play yard were in high contrast with the spacially defined, closely monitored activities of inside. "Play" in the Early Childhood Division was voluntary, chosen by children, and never directed by the teacher (King, 1979).

The patio was lined with small tables and chairs and had a sideboard for snacks. The taking of snacks was the only recurring activity in the play yard. There was a prescribed way of doing this which was demonstrated several times by Mrs. Waters. The children were expected to imitate her in this, as in toileting, washing, and lunch behavior. Her "modeling" was not fully effective for snack-time behavior, in part because it was not monitored closely. Although Maria, Rosa, and Donna ceremoniously followed Mrs. Waters' example, the others were distracted, either by hunger or interpersonal impulses or, as with Alice Wilson, just noncompliant in general.

The few rules governing play yard behaviors pertained to turn-taking with equipment and physical safety. "Do not throw sand!" and "Do not go into the gully!" (a wooded patch in the far corner of the yard)

were made explicit at the outset. These two rules differed in importance from the rule that children should take one cracker at a time during snacks, as did the sanctions associated with their violation. Taking additional crackers was treated as if a misdemeanor: after a reprimand the incident was forgotten. Throwing sand and going into the gully were more serious.

In December of the first year the teachers discussed what should be done with four boys who climbed into the gully. Mrs. Beamish concluded they should "make a big thing about it," and the boys were chastened when the children reassembled on the rug. Deliberate public humiliation was rare at the Lab school and its effect was to label both the boys and their activity as "deviant" in the eyes of others. This violation did not occur again. The unfenced gully helped children to differentiate between minor folkways and more serious norms within a protected environment.

Structure of Time

Time was valued as a crucial resource at the Laboratory School and was apportioned into fixed units based on beliefs about children's attention span and the optimum duration of the activity. Each time block was filled with activities that were justified educationally; even outside play was specified as "outdoor work" time, although it did not fit that description. As the principal put it at a Family-School meeting, the schedule was designed "to sop up precious time to engage the children's minds so they don't sit and wait." According to the posted daily schedule, children arrive between 8 and 8:30 and are assigned to some small group "prescriptive" activity such as science, art, music, or physical and health education based on

the teachers' assessment of their current "need." Between 9 and 9:30 they are outdoors and return at 9:30 for "indoor work." At 10:30 they are outdoors again or at the library, and between 11 and 11:15 they are on the rug for music, stories, or learning games. Dismissal for most of the children was at 11:15.

The recruited children had a different schedule because of their bus transportation. First, since it had been agreed that they would be picked up at a public elementary school at 8:15 (after finishing a free school-provided breakfast) they did not arrive in time for the start of first period. Second, all of the recruited children and a few of the most mature regularly-enrolled children had lunch at the school, followed by free play. Third, the recruited children remained after the others left at 2:15 to wait for the older children who rode the same bus. They were the only children not transported by car so they seldom saw their parents at school, although they could observe other parents picking up their classmates.

This schedule had consequences which set the recruited children farther apart. Each morning when they arrived, well into first period, they were instructed to sit on the edge of the sandpit until a teacher came to supervise their free play. This was no problem for the little girls who had unlimited capacity for watching sand play through their fingers, but the others were restless. They wandered about observing the activities of the small "prescriptive" groups, often staring in from doorways. Occasionally a teacher would acknowledge their presence, although seldom allowing them to satisfy their curiosity.

One day in November, Consuela stopped to watch a reading lesson and Mrs. Waters marked her presence with, "Buenas dias, muchacha, good morning," followed

with, "go and wait on the sandbox stoop." On another day, when so curious from the door frame about the "body awareness" class, Consuela took matters into her own hands and walked into the room, moved a chair to get a full view, and sat watching impassively until the class was over. Some of the children protested that she did not belong in their group, whereas the teacher ignored her. The recruited children were slow getting into the swing of things each day; they did a lot of watching, as if to define the daily situation before becoming part of it.

The isolation of these eleven children stimulated the development of their own tightly-knit group. They rode the same school bus twice each day and were alone together during part of the first and all of the last unstructured periods. They got to know one another sooner and better than they did the others and they made their friends from within the group. The informal social system resembled the family primary group in that the more able took responsibility for the less able, and there was respect and mutual aid among them. The children supported each other emotionally and seemed secure together.

Consuela and Diego assumed caretaker roles throughout the first year. They served as translators of the language as well as the culture of the school and would involve children who seemed confused or listless in some activity. In the Fall, Consuela often pointed to the seat next to her at lunch and told Juan to "sit aqui." When she finished her own "job," which was usually first, she would help the other recruited children finish their's.

Diego maintained his protector role until he left the school at the end of the second year. When a jump rope was made available the first Spring, he and

Alice were the first to try to turn it. Alice was so erratic in her turning that no one could jump and other children became hostile. Diego soothed the situation by telling her in flawless English, "We must stop now and practice turning." On another day when Diego was playing tetherball, his attention was drawn to the next court where some White/Anglo girls refused to let Carmen join them. Carmen, wandered despondently from activity to activity searching for something to do. Diego followed her with his eyes for more than ten minutes until she settled down with Consuela, then he returned to his game.

For most of the first year Carmen, Maria, and Rosa appropriated the sandpit. Carmen and Maria would venture out for short periods, at first merely watching the others, but as they gained confidence they began to participate in other activities. By Spring, Carmen and Maria played on the parallel bars and as they moved among them, they periodically called to Rosa in the sandpit to keep her informed of their whereabouts.

I observed only one argument among the recruited children--in May of the first year. It was initiated by Maria Sanchez, then angry with Donna Valentine, the one White/Anglo recruited child, because she had not accepted an invitation to her house. Donna explained, "I wanted to come but my mother wouldn't let me." Apparently this sufficed, for they resumed their friendship. Donna was frequently drawn away from Maria by regularly-enrolled Anglo girls who sought her out. On the other hand, Consuela, repeatedly initiated social contacts with the regularly-enrolled children with only intermittent success. When rejected, she would return to the group and take up her position as an informal leader.

Structure of Authority

A decided difference between school and home is the specificity that school requires. School is comprised of many children of the same age all of whom are expected to conform to the role of "pupil" which includes acceptance of teachers as their superordinates. The teachers in the Early Childhood Division were successful in creating a predictable classroom environment in which most children behaved as expected. In keeping with its visible pedagogy, the classroom moral order was arrived at with minimal input from the children. Its emphasis was on control more than guidance, on Skinnarian reinforcement more than Piaget's developmental stages. It was authoritarian and the children learned that authority was vested in the teachers who were both unquestioned symbols of authority and models of expected behavior.

Some of the teachers' authority was transferred to the signals they used to facilitate control. The sound of a bell made by striking a metal triangle figured prominently among out-of-door signals. It indicated that children were to go inside and sit on the classroom rug. The force of the signal was reinforced by verbal statements such as, "The bell just rang, it tells you to go inside," or to children who asked why they must stop what they are doing, "Because the bell rang."

Occasionally the signal was ignored. In November of the first year, three-year old Rosa was painting at an easel in the patio and disregarded the bell to complete her picture and to start a new one. She continued to paint, even after Mrs. Forrest quietly told her, "Rosa, it is time to go inside." After the request was made twice more, with increasing force,

Maria voluntarily translated it into Spanish. Rosa protested in Spanish, but after a few minutes removed the second picture, laid it on the cement to dry as she had been shown, and joined the others on the rug.

The teacher's upraised arm was a signal designed to get the collective attention of the group. It told them to stop what they are doing, raise one arm in like manner, and wait for the teacher's announcement. The technique was effective except for children who were so engaged they did not notice the silence and extended arms. This was the case with Consuela early in her second year after she moved to the Lower Elementary Division. She was unaware the "signal was on" when the teacher startled her with, "Consuela, are you going to make us do this over again?" Consuela looked up in surprise, gave a sick smile, and sheepishly raised her arm. For Consuela, who had high aspirations for achievement in all things, this must have been humiliating.

Diego had greater ability to cope with what must have seemed to him unreasonable teacher behavior. Just after he moved to the Lower Elementary Division there was an interaction with his new teacher that showed that of the two, Diego best lived up to expectations. He was tying his shoe lace while on the rug with other children listening to the teacher's instructions about the next activity. She must have thought him inattentive because she interrupted herself to say pointedly, "Oh, Diego doesn't know what we will be doing next." He looked straight at her face and repeated her instructions word-for-word, then back to his shoe without any display of affect. All the teacher said was, "Oh, you do!" but she didn't single him out after that.

By November of the first year, Consuela demonstrated that she had learned some of the authority aspects of the teacher role when she had been chosen to dismiss the children from the rug one at a time to go outside. She deliberated before each selection although the criterion she employed was not evident. Juan was lingered inside the door after he was dismissed and Consuela excused herself to go over to him. She said something softly and brought him back. Only after she excused each of the remaining children did she permit him to leave.

Correct rug behavior was reinforced by the teacher with statements of praise, especially for those whose posture was exemplary or who raised their hand before speaking. Occasionally Mrs. Waters would cover her mouth to indicate that a child had called out or would say "this is my turn to talk and yours to listen." With the exception of Alice Wilson, the recruited children had no more difficulty than others learning these expectations. They had the same kinds of problems: keeping their hands to themselves, not calling out, and maintaining attention.

Alice's problems were unique in that she responded to all obstacles with what appeared to be uncontrollable displays of temper. She seemed impervious to sanctions customarily employed at the school. By February, the staff elected to isolate her for about fifteen minutes whenever she was "out of control." Alice would scream and kick at the door of the "time-out" room, but for decreasing periods each time. Once this course was chosen it was implemented consistently. When Alice had a tantrum before some distinguished-educator visitors, Mrs. Forrest carried her bodily to an adjoining office and closed the door on the screaming child, to the embarrassment of all. Alice quieted in about five

minutes, and ten minutes later was on the play yard with the other children. Except for her red-rimmed eyes, which was common for Alice, the episode was over.

Alice was an exceptionally beautiful child with coffee-colored skin, blond hair, and green eyes; she was the daughter of a temporary alliance between an Anglo women and a young, Black man. Only four years old when she entered the Lab School, she had lived in several foster homes and was now with her father's sister who seemed to care a great deal for her. The staff' systematic, instrumental approach--to tell her how she should behave, to monitor her behavior, and to enforce it--is consistent with that recommended by behavior-oriented psychologist for children with "inconsistent" parenting (Patterson, Roy, Reid, Jones & Congers, 1975). This treatment, in conjunction with her stable home environment, changed the course of her school career. By the end of the first year Alice followed directions, coped with frustrations, and could get through the day without tears. By the beginning of the second year she acquired other aspects of the pupil role: she raised her hand to volunteer, answered while sitting on the rug, and when dismissed she frequently was the first to get to her "job." Admittedly, she squirmed in her chair, but she stayed in the chair, more relaxed than previously and with a considerably longer attention span.

The Impact of the School on Individual Children

The teachers had anticipated that the children, their older sibs, and later their younger sibs, would attend the Laboratory School through sixth grade. This did not happen. Of the original eleven who started in the Early Childhood Division, only Consuela Lopez and

Donna Valentine were enrolled for a sixth year. Jose left after the first year and Juan and Carmen Gonzales and Diego and Rosa Rodriquez left between the second and third. Jason Johnson left between the third and fourth year, Alice Wilson left in December of the fourth year, and Jorge and Maria Sanchez between the fourth and fifth years. (See Table 1.) Since achievement tests were not given until fifth grade and "progress reports" in the cumulative folders contained no grades, it is difficult to assess the extent to which academic objectives were reached. Nevertheless, from an examination of the children's files, conversations with teachers, and direct observations, it appears that the recruited children who stayed through four years performed satisfactorily. An overview of their experiences of the first few years at the Lab School follows.

Maria Sanchez. Of those who started Early Childhood together, Maria adjusted best. She was an outgoing, well-coordinated, bilingual four-year old with no prior schooling. She quickly learned appropriate school behavior, knew the English alphabet at the end of the first year, and could read when she was five. Her file shows that teachers viewed her as an accomplished, enthusiastic pupil who could follow directions and work independently. Most of her playtime was spent with Rosa Rodriquez and Carmen Gonzalez, but she was friendly and joined in activities with the other recruited children.

Jorge Sanchez. After a shakey start, her brother Jorge, age five, also adjusted well. Comments in his file indicate that he was an interested and serious pupil who made excellent academic progress, but lacked "leadership" ability. Some of his difficulties could have stemmed from a mix-up about his name which was initially given as "George." "GEORGE" was printed on

his name tag and "cubby" and teachers called him "George" well into the second month of school until his father insisted his name was "Jorge." For several weeks after that, the nonHispanic children laughed each time they heard his new name. The name change also led to administrative problems. For example, when Jorge informed the parent volunteer on the picture-taking day that his name was "Jorge" she kept him standing for over ten minutes while searching for his record. It was only after a passing child called out "Hi George" that she found his card and permitted him to be photographed. Confusion over his name persisted throughout, but he apparently accepted it and responded to "Jorge" from the staff and recruited children and to "George" from the White/Anglo boys.

Both Maria and Jorge Sanchez attended the school for four years. It is not known why they withdrew.

Diego Rodriquez. Diego and his sister Rosa also adjusted well to the school. He was five when he began, and had gone to Headstart and Kindergarten before that. He was fluent in Spanish and English, and his demonstrated reading ability while in Early Childhood prompted Mrs. Waters to say "Diego is so bright, he makes such good progress!" He was a full participant in rug activities from the start; he raised his hand before speaking and volunteered at every opportunity. Usually his answers were accurate and his comments relevant. According to his file, he progressed well academically, but in his second year a teacher reported that he was having some discipline problem, perhaps related to the rug incident noted above.

Rosa Rodriquez. At first Rosa looked bewildered, was poorly coordinated, and did not speak or comprehend English. The teachers ascribed this to the fact that she was only three. By Spring she began to speak and

understand English and to smile a lot. By Fall her brown baby hightops were replaced with jogging shoes and she typically dressed in blue jeans. Rosa's behavior in the second year was as appropriate for the Early Childhood Division as her new appearance. Teachers reported her progress as satisfactory.

Diego and Rosa Rodriquez left the Lab School the end of the second year. Their leaving was said to be related to the termination of the bus.

Carmen Gonzalez. Carmen and Juan were the third brother-sister pair. Although Carmen was almost eight when she left the school she had not acquired basic skills in literacy or mathematics. She seldom paid attention when instructions were given; rather she fidgeted with her hands and clothing or gazed around the room and out the window. Her free time was spent with younger recruited children and she was animated only with them. It was clear that she had not acquired proficiency in English. Her file made no mention of achievement, but rather, "she needs to be more focused...is very shy," and has a "neutral affect toward school tasks."

Juan Gonzalez. Juan's mastery of educational objectives was below expectation and comments in his file indicated that his teachers thought he needed to "verbalize" more. He was shy during the first few months, but once he spoke English he was vivacious and curious about all that went on. Juan's school experience differed from Carmen's which may account for his superior social adjustment. He was given special attention by Mrs. Beamish and the older Latino children who mentored him until he mastered English. In contrast, Carmen was identified as a "misfit" after only a few days in school; she was transferred from the Lower Elementary to the Early Childhood Division where she

was one of the oldest but least accomplished children. Whether intervention at that time would have set her on a more satisfactory course cannot be known.

Carmen and Juan left the school at the end of the second year and enrolled in the local school, reportedly because of the termination of the bus.

Jose Rojo. Jose started the Lab school at five and one-half. He got along well with all children and seemed to have an especially good time with the recruited boys. He was large and well-coordinated for his age, but not judged ready for the Lower Elementary Division the second year. There was dissension within the staff about this decision, with those who opposed his retention contending that he would not be happy in Early Childhood without his friends and more weight should be given to his level of physical and social development.

Jose withdrew over the first summer which some teachers ascribed to his Fall assignment. He was the first of the recruited children to leave and the only one who did not complete at least two years.

Alice Wilson. Alice was four when she came to the Lab School and was the only recruited Black girl. Her extremely low frustration level which led to tantrums in the first year are noted above. The staff employed contingency reinforcement, including isolation in a "time-out" room, with remarkable consistency, bringing her tantrums under control. Although she continued to cry when frustrated, the positive changes in her behavior were striking. Initially, she was a nonresponsive, isolated, and unhappy child who exercised little self-control. A year later her facial muscles were more relaxed, she met pupil-role expectations more often, and showed signs of cognitive mastery. However, in her fourth year, after she moved to the Lower Elementary

Division, the school contacted her family about her disobedience.

Alice left the school during the fourth year; it is not known if her departure was related to her reported behavior problems.

Jason Johnson. Jason, who was also Black, was shy and made little academic progress. His father explained to Mrs. Beamish that "Jason didn't like his other school....He would make himself sick so he didn't have to go." Then added, "Jason doesn't like to talk to adults. He has his reasons, I respect them." Jason had difficulty relating to adults at the Lab school as well, and of his peers he talked mostly with Juan and Alice. His school file contains nothing about his academic progress, but refers several times to his shyness. It was apparent at the end of the second year that, unlike the others in his group, he had not learned to read his name or recognize his first initial. Mrs. Beamish casually commented that "Jason isn't much interested in indoor activities, especially cognitive things."

Jason and his brother, who also attended the Lab School, returned to the local school at the end of the third year. It was reported that the family was disgruntled over the academic progress of his older brother.

Donna Valentine. Donna was most like the regularly-enrolled children, not only because she was White/Anglo, but because she had many middle-class cultural characteristics in spite of mother's reported poverty. She was articulate, followed directions precisely, completed all tasks accurately, and interacted appropriately with peers and adults. She learned to read at age five, in her second year at school. Donna was a dainty, pretty girl and well-developed physically despite her small size. These

attributes made her attractive to others and her interpersonal success seemed assured. She was courted by older Anglo girls and impassively tolerated their attention except when they stroked her cheek or kissed her. Then she would respond with a firm, "Don't!" Her mother complained to the teachers that Donna did not like the older girls' solicitude; she was capable of taking care of herself and wanted to be independent. Donna continued to be other children's plaything, even after she moved to the Lower Elementary Division. She was unusually self-confident and only in the third year did this waiver when occasionally she looked for models among other children.

Donna was at the Lab School in the 1985-86 school year, enrolled in the highest grade.

Consuela Lopez. The change in Consuela over the first two years was the most marked of all of the recruited children. Her second year evaluation was not strong in that her achievement was reported to be "good," but she needed to be more "focused." In contrast to the first year, she seldom volunteered and when she did, her answers often were wrong. In addition to having to accept the univeralistic orientation of the staff, she had difficulty gaining the approval she sought from regularly-enrolled classmates. Unlike Donna who received excessive attention, Consuela tried but was not accepted routinely by the the Anglo girls. According to Mrs. Beamish, Consuela "knows she needs to integrate. She would do almost anything to be accepted by Caroline and the others, but she is also smart enough to know that she is different." When accepted, Consuela was outgoing and smiling; when obviously rejected she was passive and sober. By the first spring, Consuela was "marginal" in that she had two

reference groups: the Anglo girls and the other recruited children. She touched base periodically with Latino children and often monitored the affairs of each from a solitary perch on top of a wooden climbing structure.

When Consuela started school she, like Donna, had many characteristics that typically lead to success. Her pretty face was made even more beautiful by the contrast of her dark hair and bright eyes against her light skin. She was engaging, independent, self-assured, and competent in all things. She expressed herself well in English without interference from her equal proficiency in Spanish. But socialization to the pupil role required Consuela to suppress some of her customary ways. Her warm personalism with adults and her expectation of reciprocal warmth and extra rewards for excellence were inconsistent with the value neutral orientation of the school. One day in December of the first year she uncharacteristically was sitting idly at a table. Mrs. Beamish explained:

> Consuela is having a hard time. She always wants to be number one and knows that she can't be. She is the kind you would let be your assistant if you were a bad teacher, but you've got to let others have a turn. She is learning that.

Her striving for perfection and her charming ways had almost disappeared by the end of the first year, having been replaced by solemnity and confusion. By the end of the second year her energetic sparkle was gone completely. Consuela was enrolled in the highest grade of the Lab School in 1985-86.

The Children's Impact on the School

The recruited children scarcely affected the Early Childhood Division of the Lab School. There was no modification in presentation or content of its visible pedagogy and, except to solve problems emanating from the bus schedule (their classmates both arrived and left before they did) there were few other changes. The vice principal was placed in charge of transportation, but no one oversaw the program as a whole. Moreover, the Early Childhood Division had no "lead" teacher who might have assessed its impact on the children. From the perspective of the School the program was a nuisance. It was thrust upon the School by the College and burdened its staff and financial resources.

The major accommodation to the recruited children was an alternative in which free play substituted for the small "prescriptive" groups of first period and a rest period and additional free play were provided at the end of the school day. The only teacher heard to question the wisdom of the recruitment was Mrs. Beamish. She commented throughout the first year about the length of the day and how tired the children became. In May she mused aloud about alternatives and asserted that, "A lot of good things go on in the public schools. There are many fine teachers; we work with them; we know." On another occasion she told a college-student aide:

> When Jose left last night he was crying; he comes back crying. That's the story of the bus. I am all for the neighborhood school-- more and more. You can quote me on that.

Mrs Beamish had enormous empathy for the recruited children which she expressed in unrealistically high assessments of their growth and potential. She was different from the other teachers: a "developmental" teacher (Metz, 1978) who was affectively involved. She often said the recruited children were not the same as the "others" and needed different kinds of school experiences. As best she could, she provided what she thought each child should have, which often deviated from the visible pedagogical orientation of the school.

Very few teachers expressed frustration over their inability to communicate with monolingual Spanish children, and most denied evidence that they were not understood. Examples of the latter were the insistence that Carmen spoke English with a speech impediment and that Rosa was too "young" to know. Only with Juan's toileting accident did some confront the fact that he did not comprehend carefully specified directions. In spite of this, special support such as classroom translators or ESL instruction was never proposed. The school had no pull-out remedial programs, contending instead that all children could master the established curriculum, albeit at different rates. Moreover, only one adult in the Lab School had knowledge of Spanish, but she taught at an upper-grade level. Some parents of the recruited children complained to the original recruiter that when they did come to school, there was no adult with whom they could speak.

In discussing an early draft of this report with several teachers who had been in the Early Childhood Division, their ambivalence about the recruitment was apparent. While they showed warmth toward the children and delight in reading about them, they regretted they had not been able to "do more." In retrospect they believed they had needed special help. They had been

informed that the recruitment was a "special project" but no one told them "in what way the children were special or what to do." They said it was well into the first year before they even wondered whether "business as usual, because it had been good for children in the past, was appropriate." With respect to monolingual Spanish children, one teacher replied, "I can't answer why the language barrier wasn't dealt with, but I think we did the best we could given the initial strength of the students."

After six years, the only observable residue of the recruitment "project" was the continued presence of Donna and Consuela and occasional questions about why their peers had left the school.

Summary

The College Laboratory School had many fine qualities often absent in schools attended by low-income and minority children. To recap: there were sufficient teachers, carefully trained and dedicated to the cognitive development of all of the children; the curriculum was rational and clearly specified; the methodology was consistent and adhered to a set of integrated psychological principles; and the school plant was aesthetic and functional for the objectives of the school. Among its other positive features was the expectation that each child would meet the school's educational objectives which created a self-fulfilling prophecy for all but four of the recruited children.

Nevertheless, the recruited children were adversely affected by other of its qualities. The school's "incorporative" ethos, which embraced an inflexible "visible" pedagogy to impart a pre-specified curriculum,

ignored the children's diversity, and its ambience of assuredness assuaged teachers' doubts about this pedagogical stance. The School's intellectual orientation, premised on cognitive learning theory, minimized the effect of the social climate and gave no mandate to teachers to help mold a healthy social system. Furthermore, the absence of nonWhite/Anglo educators denied all children the opportunity to observe equal status relationships across racial-ethnic lines and precluded the recruited children from identifying relevant role models within the school.

The recruitment project was not a success if judged by the extent to which the School's pedagogy can be "generalized." It fell short in the small number of children who enrolled--less than the 10 to 20 percent needed for a critical mass (Hawley, 1981; Kanter, 1977), and in its lack of holding power over those who did. The two children who remained were most like those regularly-enrolled: Donna who was middle class in manner, vocabulary, and appearance, and Consuela who entered the school with high drive for achievement and excellent facility in English.

Decisions to leave the school came at different times and were precipitated by different events. Termination of the bus after two years accounted for four of the six withdrawals before the third year, and the policy against "social" promotion probably accounted for the first. One child left in the middle of the year in which her family was notified of her poor conduct. Stress and fatigue generated by their unique time schedule and marginal social status may have been other factors in attrition. For example, the children learned at school they were not included in the home visits and birthday parties of the others. Also, it is possible that some parents were ambivalent about socialization

to the mainstram culture of the Lab School. Mr. Sanchez' insistence that his son's name was "Jorge," the Spanish equivalent of "George," hints at the importance he placed on maintaining Latino culture.

Most of the recruited children learned pupil behaviors as understood by their present and future teachers. As early as the first week they grasped some of the school's norms, and those who stayed longest understood them best. They learned they were part of a larger cohort of pupils about whom similar expectation were made (universalism), that distinctions between adults and children and among children themselves were legitimate for some purposes (specificity), that their school work must meet a specified standard (achievement), and that they were responsible for their own behavior (independence). With the exception of Alice, the in-school behavior of all of the bussed children was adequate, and with the exception of Consuela, they seemed content with the amount of teacher attention they received.

But as the children acquired mainstream culture they also learned of its negative consequences. Because the school's visible pedagogy made no recognition of individual background, many became aware that their customary ways of speaking, dressing, and eating were not endorsed. And when universalism was suspended at the beginning and end of each day, all of the children learned that the children from the bus were different. The fact is that the school-related experiences of the recruited children <u>were</u> different: in their time schedule; in the relative absence of their parents from the school; in the irrelevance of their own language and culture; in the lower educational resources their parents provided; and in their limited nonschool contact with nonrecruited classmates. What stands out

in this study is that although the Lab School purported to treat pupils universalistically, universalism was misapplied. It was under-applied when the recruited children were assigned alternate schedules that removed them spatially from their classmates and it was wrongfully applied in its disregarded for the knowledge and language the children brought with them.

For three of the Latino children the experience was one of immersion, or more correctly "submersion" as one teacher put it, both in culture and language. For the five who were bilingual, it was immersion into a second culture and most were able to transcend the differences. Although not the focus of the study, the observations suggest that "structured" immersion in a hospitable environment with appropriate emotional and cognitive support can make for easy transition to a second language (Baker and de Kanter, 1983; Lambert and Tucker, 1972; Otheguy, 1982). The experience of monolingual-Spanish Rosa is illustrative. She became English proficient with no apparent distress, but had been assisted by older bilingual children. In contrast, Juan, who initially was a "loner," did not know what was wanted of him since expectations were communicated in a foreign tongue. Because no one translated them, he was humiliated until his need for special help was realized.

Conclusions

Despite the Lab School's perceived excellence in educating young middle-class children, it is not an appropriate early childhood model for a desegregated setting. Its "visible" pedagogy, which emphasizes acquisition of basic skills and related behaviors, gives scant attention to important social outcomes such

as crosscultural and interracial understanding and development of the positive idiosyncrasies of individual children. Its assimilationist ideology, which excludes pluralistic curriculums, implies that mainstream culture is better than others and children stratify themselves by their prior knowledge and experience. And its "colorblind" universalism, which assumes pupils cannot be distinguished by their out-of-school socialization, obscured the need for "affirmative" treatment within the school for some of the recruited children.

Most condemning is the fact that no one spoke for the bussed children: no professionals were charged with monitoring their adaptation to school and, in spite of verbal recognition of constructive use of time, no one objected to their being "warehoused" for part of each day. It is unlikely that parents of the other children would have tolerated such treatment. The recruited parents may have been unaware of it for they seldom came to the school which was strange and sometimes humiliating for them. Moreover, monolingual Spanish parents could not communicate with in-school adults. Not only were the recruited children given differential treatment, but nothing was done to ameliorate their "token" status. While this situation may not have been apparent to the teachers who were busy with their own responsibilities, it was clear to most children and was responsible for their self-segregation.

It is concluded from this study that the optimum programs for desegregated early childhood education are traditional, developmentally-oriented ones in which schooling is an extension of the family. Most appropriate are the assumptions underlying the British Infant School which fosters a flexible <u>invisible pedagogy</u> allowing for recognition of children's previous and concurrent socialization (Bernstein, 1977)

and employs developmentally oriented teachers who put the needs of the children above the demands of an explicit curriculum (Metz, 1978). The alternative to this approach is the elongation of elementary education with emphasis on acquisition of academic skills and related behaviors. Although the importance of socialization to the gesellschaft society (Dreeben, 1968) is not minimized, goals relating to self-esteem and the development of social attitudes and competences are of prime importance. From this study it appears that low-income minority children are served best if the initial focus of their education is on the children themselves--their affect, their developmental level, their knowledge and interests, and their interaction with other children. With a strong, healthy, and happy school foundation, the transition from where they are to where they need to be to maximize their social chances can be made at a later time.

References

Averch, H. A., Carroll, S. J., Donaldson, T. S., Kiesling, H. J. & Pincus, J. (1972). How effective is schooling?: A critical review and synthesis of research findings. Santa Monica: Rand Corporation.

Baker, K. & de Kanter (1983). Federal policy and the effectiveness of bilingual education. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education.

Bernstein, B. (1977). Class, codes and control: Vol. 3 Towards a theory of educational transmissions (2nd ed.).London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Brookover, W., Beady, N. M & Warfield, M (1979). School social systems and student achievement: Schools can make a difference. N.Y.: Praeger.

Cohen, E. G. (1975). The effects of desegregation on race relations. Law and Contemporary Problems, 39, 271-299.

Cole, D. A. (1986). Facilitating play in children's peer relationships: Are we having fun yet? American Educational Research Journal, 23, 201-215.

Coleman, J. S., Campbell, E., Q, Hobson, C. J., McPartland, J., Mood, A. M., Weinfeld, F. D. & York, R. (1966). Equality of educational opportunity. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.

Coleman,J. S., Hoffer, T. & Kilgore, S. (1981). Public and private schools (Final report). Washington, D. C.: National Center for Education Statistics.

Crain, R. & Mahard, R. E. (1981). Desegregation plans that raise black achievement: A review of the research. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation.

Damico, S. B. & Sparks, C. (1986). Cross-group contact opportunities: Impact on interpersonal relationships in desegregated middle schools. Sociology of Education 59, 113-123.

Dreeben, R. (1968). On what is learned in school. Reading, MASS: Addison Wesley.

Gracey, H. L.(1975). Learning the student role: Kindergarten as academic boot camp. In H. R. Stub (Ed) The sociology of education: A sourcebook. Homewood, IL: Dorsey.

Hallinan, M. & Tuma, N. B. (1978). Classroom effects on change in children's friendships. Sociology of Education, 51, 270-282.

Hawley, W. D. (1981). Equity and Quality in Education: Characteristics of effective desegregated schools. In Hawley, E. D. (Ed) Effective school desegregation: Equity, Quality, and Feasibility. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Henry, J. (1955). Docility or giving the teacher what she wants. Journal of Social Issues, 2, 33-41.

Heyns, B. (1978). Summer learning and the effects of schooling. New York: Academic Press.

Hurn, C. J. (1985). The limits and possibilities of schooling. 2nd ed. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Jackson, P. (1968). Life in classrooms. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kanter, R. (1972). The organization child: experience management in a nursery school. Sociology of Education, 45,186-211.

Kanter, R. (1977). Men and women of the corporation. New York: Basic Books.

King, N. R. (1979). The kindergartener's perspective of play. Elementary School Journal, 80 80-87.

Lambert, W. E. & Tucker, G.R. (1972). Bilingual education of children: The St. Lambert experiment. Rowley, MASS: Newbury House.

Mercer, J. R., Coleman, M. & Harloe, J. (1974). Racial/ethnic segregation and desegregation in American public education. In C. W. Gordon (Ed.) Uses of the sociology of education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Metz, M. H. (1978). Classrooms and corridors. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Mosteller, F, & Moynihan, D. P.(1972). On equality of educational opportunity. New York: Random House.

National Center for Education Statistics (1985). Digest of educational statistics. Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office.

O'Shea, D.(1984). Teacher education: an empirical study of problems and possibilities. Journal of Education for Teaching, 10, 2-23.

Parsons, T. (1959) The School Class as a social system: Some of its functions in American society. Harvard Educational Review, 29, 297-318.

Patterson, G. R., Roy, G., Reid, J., Jones, R. R. & Congers, R.(1975). A social learning approach to family intervention: Families with aggressive children Vol. I. Champaigne, IL: Research Press.

Rist, R. C. (1978). The invisible children. : School integration in American society. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Rutter, M.,Maughan, B. Mortimore, P. & Ouston, J. (1979). Fifteen Thousand Hours: Secondary schools and their effects on children. Cambridge, MASS: Harvard University Press.

St.John, N. (1975). School desegregation. New York: Wiley.

Schlechty, P. C. (1985). Teaching and social behavior. In J. H. Ballantine (Ed) Schools and society: A reader in education and sociology. Palo Alto: Mayfield.

Schofield, J. W. (1982). Black and white in school: Trust, tension, or tolerance? New York: Praeger.

Wolcott, H. F. (1976). Criteria for an ethnographic approach to research in schools. In J. Roberts & Akinsanya, S. K. (Eds) Schooling in the cultural context: Anthropological studies in education. New York: David McKay.

Wolcott, H. F. (1973). The man in the principal's office: An ethnography. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.